

REMARKS

Applicants received a Restriction Requirement mailed March 26, 2008. In the present response, claims 1-19 are pending, and have not been amended.

The Restriction Requirement indicated that the present application includes claims directed to three inventions, as follows:

- I. Claims 1-9, drawn to a method for determining a security risk level;
- II. Claims 10-16, drawn to a method for producing a recommendation;
- III. Claims 17-19, drawn to a system for inspections.

In response to the Restriction Requirement, and without acquiescing to the statements made therein, Applicants elect, with traverse, Group I, claims 1-9, for prosecution in this application. Applicants traverse the Restriction Requirement on two grounds. First, although the Examiner indicates that Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations, the Office Action lists no different utility for each of these subcombinations. Rather, only a difference between Group I and Group III is listed. Therefore, the Office Action has not established independent patentability or utility between Groups I and II, as described in M.P.E.P. § 806.05(d). Because the Office Action makes no such specific distinction between Groups I and II, Applicants respectfully assert that restriction between at least these two groups should not be maintained.

Second, "restriction is only proper where there would be a serious burden if restriction were not required, as evidenced by separate classification, status, or field of search." M.P.E.P. § 806.05(d). In the present situation, all of Groups I-III are listed in the Restriction Requirement as classified in class 705, subclass 1. This common classification indicates that the inventions can be grouped and examined in a common application.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement and examination of claims 1-19. However, to the extent that the Examiner upholds the Restriction Requirement, Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims directed to the non-elected inventions in one or more subsequent divisional applications.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request examination and a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney, Richard Gregson, Reg. No. 41,804, at (215) 986-3325.

This response is directed to a Unisys Corporation matter. Please continue to direct all official correspondence to Unisys; however, any questions specific to the present response should be directed to Merchant & Gould.

Respectfully submitted,

UNISYS CORPORATION
Unisys Way, MS/EG-114
Blue Bell, PA 19424
(215) 986-3325

Dated: 6 May 2008

By 

Richard J. Gregson
Reg. No. 41,804